



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,116	02/14/2001	Garth F. Schmeling	10001605-1	3838

7590 08/28/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,116

Applicant(s)

SCHMELING ET AL.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Appeal Brief filed on August 7, 2006. Original application contained claims 1 – 35. Presently, pending claims are 1 – 5, 7 – 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on August 7, 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 – 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S Patent 6,105,027), in view of Fleskes (U.S Patent 6,529,910).

As per claim 1 and 13, Schneider teaches a method for sharing data including the steps of:

receiving, from a user of a client, a request for data from a server (Schneider : Column 2 Line 11 – 14),

obtaining access rights for the user (Schneider : Column 1 Line 58 – 61); and

downloading to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet (Schneider : Figure 24 & Column 27 Line 23 – 25, Column 26 Line 65 – Column 27 Line 3 and Column 27 Line 35 – 51: According to Microsoft Computer Dictionary (Fifth Edition), “access right” is defined as the type of access permitted a given user for a certain resource on a network or a file server (Page 14). Schneider’s Access Control List 2431 (Column 27 Line 44 – 51 and Figure 24 / Element 2431) that is downloaded via LAN 213 to client’s IntraMap applet 2411 at Web Browser 2409 is qualified as the access

Art Unit: 2131

right downloading to the client, as recited in the claim because the List 2431 contains a list of resources and associated indicators of access right – for example, if the resource has a URL indicator, then the resource is available to the user for access; otherwise, if the resource has an indicator of an administrator's email address, then the resource is not available to the user for access).

Schneider teaches the applet being operable to produce an IntraMap display (Schneider : Column 26 Line 65 – Column 27 Line 3); however, Schneider does not disclose expressly customizing a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

Fleskes teaches customizing a display of the data by the client according to the access rights (Fleskes : Column 10 Line 55 – 56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Fleskes within the system of Schneider because (a) Schneider teaches providing a method to control of access to data in a distributed environment (Schneider: Column 1 Line 28 – 30) and (b) Fleskes teaches automatically generating web page based on the client's access right (Fleskes : Column 1 Line 14 – 17 and Column 10 Line 45 – 56).

As per claim 2, Schneider as modified teaches verifying that the user has access rights for the data (Schneider : Column 27 Line 35 – 51).

As per claim 3, Schneider as modified teaches verifying includes the step of authenticating a digital signature (Schneider : Column 10 Line 63 – 65).

As per claim 4, Schneider as modified teaches the step of verifying includes the step of authenticating a private key (Schneider : Column 10 Line 59).

As per claim 5, Schneider as modified teaches the step of verifying includes the step of authenticating a public key (Schneider : Column 10 Line 59).

As per claim 7 and 16, Schneider as modified teaches allowing modification of the data according to the access rights (Schneider : Column 9 Line 61 – 67).

As per claim 12, Schneider as modified teaches the applet causing the client to display a view of the data for the user, the view being customized according to the access rights (Fleskes : Column 10 Line 55 – 56).

As per claim 18, Schneider as modified teaches including means for verifying a user's identity before the agent causes the server to download the data to the client (Schneider : Column 10 Line 10 – 43 and Column 27 Line 35 – 51).

As per claim 35, Schneider as modified teaches said access rights are stored in a database (Schneider : Column 27 Line 36).

2. Claims 8 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S Patent 6,105,027), in view of Fleskes (U.S Patent 6,529,910), and in view of Ginter (U.S Patent 6,253,193).

As per claim 8, Schneider as modified does not disclose expressly tracking changes in said document.

Ginter teaches tracking changes in said document (Ginter: Column 243 Line 17 – 21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ginter within the system of Schneider as modified because (a) Schneider teaches providing a method to control of access to data in a distributed environment (Schneider: Column 1 Line 28 – 30) and (b) Ginter teaches provides mechanisms for tracking documents inside the protected distributed environment (Ginter: Column 243 Line 17 – 21 and Column 267 Line 54).

As per claim 9, Schneider as modified does not disclose expressly tracking access of said document.

1. Ginter teaches tracking access of said document (Ginter: Column 243 Line 17 – 21). Same rationale of combination applies herein as above in rejecting the claim 8.

As per claim 10, Schneider as modified does not disclose expressly tracking submission of documents.

Ginter teaches tracking submission of documents (Ginter: Column 267 Line 54). Same rationale of combination applies herein as above in rejecting the claim.
8.

2. Claims 15 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S Patent 6,105,027), in view of Fleskes (U.S Patent 6,529,910), and in view of Barron (U.S Patent 2001/0042124).

As per claim 15 and 30, Schneider as modified does not disclose expressly the applet is operable to decrypt the data and the access rights.

Barron teaches the applet is operable to decrypt the data and the access rights (Barron: Para [0024] Line 9 – 17; Ginter: Column 14 Line 30 – 36; Schneider).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Barron within the system of Schneider as modified because Barron teaches a virtually enhanced security for a web-based applet software system for access, delivery, storage and sharing of documents and files (Barron: see for example, Para [0022]).

3. Claims 22, 27, 29 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S Patent 6,105,027), in view of Fleskes (U.S Patent 6,529,910), and in view of Wang (U.S Patent 6,937,726).

As per claim 22, Schneider as modified does not disclose expressly the session key has been encrypted with a public key for the user.

Wang teaches the session key has been encrypted with a public key for the user (Wang: Column 22 Line 24 – 29).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Wang within the system of Schneider as modified because Wang teaches providing a enhanced cryptographic method to protect data files / documents by periodically refreshing a decryption key (Wang: see for example, Column 1 Line 11 – 13).

As per claim 27 and 34, Schneider as modified teaches means for random generating said session key (Wang: Column 22 Line 24 - 29).

As per claim 29, the claim limitations are met as the same reasons as that set forth in the paragraph above regarding to claim 22 with the exception of the feature the agent is operable to cause the server to download the encrypted session key to the client along with the applet, the encrypted access rights, and the encrypted data. However, Schneider as modified further teaches the agent is operable to cause the

server to download the encrypted session key to the client along with the applet, the encrypted access rights, and the encrypted data (Schneider: Column 10 Line 30 - 33).

4. Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S Patent 6,105,027), in view of Fleskes (U.S Patent 6,529,910), and in view of Wang (Patent Number: 6937726), and in view of Barron (Publication Number: 2001 /0042124).

As per claim 23, claims 23 does not further teach over claims 22 as addressed above (i.e.) to decrypt the session key with a private key for the user and to decrypt the data and the access rights with the decrypted session key (Examiner notes the decryption techniques at the data receiving side is the counter part of the encryption techniques at the data transmitting side) with the exception of the applet is operable for the decryption of the objects as addressed above. However, Barron further teaches the applet is operable for the decryption of the objects as addressed above (Barron: Para [0024] Line 9 - 17).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Barron within the system of Schneider as modified because Barron teaches a virtually enhanced security for a web-based applet software system for access, delivery, storage and sharing of documents and files (Barron- see for example, Para [0022]).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


LBC

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100